

## From the Editor

Tara Behrend

The George Washington University

I'm writing this, my first column as editor, from the conference hotel after a whirlwind annual conference. During the week, I learned just how important TIP is to SIOP members. Two stories in particular stand out to me. 1) In a pre-conference event, I heard a story from **Walter Reichman** about how he first met his longtime collaborator **Stuart Carr**. Walter was working as a consultant and thinking about his professional direction. He had become very interested in international development but hadn't considered how this interest might overlap with I-O. Walter picked up the newest issue of TIP, and came across an [article](#) by Stu, entitled "I-O Psychology and Poverty Reduction—Past, Present, and Future." Walter cold-called Stu to discuss, and that meeting became the impetus for Humanitarian Work Psychology. They credit the birth of this organization and research area to meeting each other through the pages of TIP. 2) Later that same afternoon, I heard a talk from **Sean Cruse**. He described the process by which he obtained his current position at the United Nations Global Compact. Turns out, he first learned about the organization from an article in TIP, and he called the article's author to find out more. That call turned into an internship, which turned into a job, which turned into a ten-year career.

These two stories capture the essence of TIP. It is a publication that allows us to connect with each other: to learn about new ideas, new opportunities, and new challenges that face our field. I have no doubt that many of you have similar stories about reading TIP. Feel free to tweet them at me, where they will promptly be lost forever because I don't know how to use Twitter yet (I'm learning!). Or you can email your stories to me instead: behrend@gwu.edu. Tell me what your favorite TIP article is and why you love it.

## Open Access

TIP is also important because it is SIOP's only open-access publication. That is powerful. Open access is so important to scientific progress that the Netherlands is using its turn as head of the European Union to [push for it](#). In these pages, anyone with a desire to do so can connect with the great minds of our field to do their best work. This is also our venue for sharing information and resources with the public, and I hope you will take advantage of it.

Openness is critically important to the science and practice of I-O psychology. This issue of TIP has several important articles that focus on this theme and help move us forward in thinking about this issue and developing good habits. First, **Chris Baker, Frank Bosco, Krista Uggerslev and Piers Steel** report on their metaBUS tool. MetaBUS is a free resource available to researchers and practitioners that is showing how openness can change the field profoundly though meta-analyses. Second, you can find in this issue a Call for Proposals for updated rankings of I-O psychology graduate programs, from **Nick Salter, Joseph Allen, Allison Gabriel, Dave Sowinski, and Loren Naidoo**. This initiative will stand apart from previous rankings because multiple teams will pre-register their methods, collect data independently, and share it with others. By following open practices, we will learn about how differences in methodologies may change our conclusions about graduate program quality. Finally, the Scientific Affairs Committee has written a terrific call to action for all SIOP members to reflect on what SIOP's contributions to good scientific practice can be. I'm delighted to share these articles with you and hope they set the stage for further conversations.

## Changes to Format and Content

You may have noticed something different about the look of TIP this month. We are saying goodbye to the flipbook and presenting articles in fully html format. In the coming months and years, you will see some more changes to the look of TIP. We will continue to move toward becoming a truly online publication, with html articles that allow for videos, links, and interactive features embedded. In my next column, I'll share some data about how TIP is being read, shared, and cited, and how I hope to use this data to make additional changes over time.

I encourage you to use these changes in the publication to change your own habits about how you read TIP. Are you a skimmer? A searcher? As an experiment, try reading it "cover to cover" (do web pages have covers? Perhaps not.) See what you discover about the inspiring work your colleagues are doing.

### **Frequently Asked Questions**

I appreciate the warm welcome I have received from SIOP members. I'm all the more excited about this gig, knowing that TIP is so valued. I have received some terrific questions, too—which I'd like to answer here in a quick Frequently Asked Questions section:

***Q: Hey! What happened to my favorite column? You monster!***

A: Don't worry. Some columns have changed in frequency, but none are going away altogether. Plus, there are terrific new columns to win your heart: check out Crash Course in Technology; Lost in Translation; Getting to Know SIOP Award Winners; and Learning About Learning!

***Q: Will you bring back paper copies of TIP?***

A: No.

***Q: Why not!***

A: It is still technologically challenging to print a video, as far as I know.

***Q: Can you write a piece about X topic?***

A: No, but you can! Send me your best work.

***Q: How can I help TIP?***

A: Writing an article would be a great start. Case studies, news, ideas, and opinions of broad interest to the SIOP community are welcome. Consider getting in touch with a regular column editor and collaborating on a column if you have an idea that will fit with their vision. Or, volunteer as a peer reviewer.

### **In This Issue**

This issue has a lot of content you should read. As mentioned above, three feature articles are organized around a special theme of Openness. Additionally, **Stephanie Payne and Joy Oliver** report out on the updated guidelines for Education and Training in I-O Psychology. The LGBT Committee (**Katina Sawyer, Jayden Thai, Larry Martinez, Nicholas Smith, & Steve Discont**) gives a comprehensive overview of issues that affect trans people in the workplace. **Ted Axton, Ben Porr, Soner Dumani, & Meredith Ferro** give an update on member survey results relating to licensure issues. The team from PTC/MW, DC's local I-O group, reports on their successful annual graduate student consulting challenge. And **Jeffrey Cucina & Fresia Jackson** update Landy's (1997) psychology family trees with recent SIOP presidents.

There are some new editorial columns making their debut in this issue. **Richard Landers** begins his “Crash Course in Technology” series by giving us a crash course in the r programming language. **Amy DuVernet** and **Tom Whelan** kick off “Leaning about Learning,” which will cover the intersections of I-O and Learning & Development, highlighting what we can learn from each other. **Liberty Munson** and **Garett Howardson’s** “Getting to Know SIOP’s Award Winners” will let us get close to the brilliant folks who win SIOP’s awards by presenting interviews with a personal touch. And, “Lost in Translation” from **Andrew Collmus** and **Michael Litano** will help us with the eternal struggle of communicating about I-O to a variety of non-I-O audiences. These new columnists join our existing team of columnists and bring light to some important and broad-reaching issues.

I hope you will read this whole issue of TIP to discover something you weren’t looking for. There are reports from SIOP’s committees, special initiatives, and officers. There are survey results and data analyses. There are announcements galore. In short, this issue of TIP will help you do your job better. It will make you a more well-rounded professional and probably a better person. Don’t skip it.

I’ll close here with a too-brief note of thanks to **Morrie Mullins**, outgoing editor, for leaving TIP in such good shape and for all his wise advice and assistance to date. Although I was initially skeptical about some of his advice, it is already proving to be true. He warned me that I might lose sleep about TIP. I scoffed at the very idea! Until last night, when I found myself wondering what color would be best for the web headings as I drifted off to sleep.

---

## President's Column

### **Mort McPhail** Reflections on the Conference

As I write this column, I can’t help but remember our remarkable Conference in Anaheim. Perhaps we just absorbed the energy coming in waves from the cheerleader competition, but wherever it came from it was amazing. A walk through the hotel lobby or down the corridors of the Conference Center never failed to find people by the dozens engaged in spirited conversation and sometimes deep discussions. Maybe it’s like that every year, and I was just more attuned to it, but it seemed to reflect the vigor of our growing profession. I want to offer my sincerest thanks to the Administrative Office staff for once again bringing us a flawless conference, including pristine weather ordered up especially for us – great work, **Dave Nershi!** Special thanks go to **Eden King** (Conference Chair), **Scott Tonidandel** (Program Chair), and **Emily Solberg** (Workshop Chair) whose diligence and hard work paid off handsomely. I also want to express my appreciation to the many (more than 1,000!) of you who served as reviewers for program submissions. SIOP is truly a member-driven organization and our Conference would suffer without your contributions and efforts.

But wait – there’s more! Don’t forget that our next gathering is the 12<sup>th</sup> Annual Leading Edge Consortium (LEC) scheduled for October 21-22 at the InterContinental Buckhead in Atlanta, GA. **Alexis Fink** and her committee have lined up a stellar cast of speakers to deal with the fascinating complexities of Big Data in a conference titled: Talent Analytics: Data Science to Drive People Decisions and Business

Impact. You won't want to miss this opportunity to catch the leading edge of where I think I-O science is going in the future – and maybe is getting there already.

Oh, yes, one more thing. It's not too early to start planning for the SIOP's 32<sup>nd</sup> Annual Conference April 27-29 in beautiful Orlando, FL. Several people asked me at the Conference this year if we had made some nefarious deal with Disney to schedule back-to-back conferences in their backyards. Well...it might have been a good idea, but no, that's not the reason. As it happens Starwood Hotels which operates the Swan and Dolphin property at Disney World made us a very beneficial offer to contract for both next year and 2018 (in Chicago), and our site selection chair and the Executive Board took advantage of it. So we got a great deal to go great places for our Conference! Start planning now.

I continue to be amazed at the number of people involved and the amount of work being accomplished behind the scenes for SIOP. As I prepared for the Executive Board meeting on the Sunday after the Conference, I found almost 60 pages of reports from committees, task forces, and other groups describing their work for the last year and their plans for the future. I can't begin to talk about everything that's going on here, but at the risk of offending some really hard-working folks by leaving them out (just so you know, I appreciate all of you), I thought I might mention a few things that are happening.

First, though, as an aside, I recently reviewed the initial results of a survey about volunteering at SIOP. I noted that the second most frequently chosen reason for not volunteering at SIOP (after Unavoidable Time Constraints) was "No one has asked me to volunteer recently." I just can't let that go; please take this as your personal invitation to become involved in the work of SIOP! There are many tasks that need doing, and you are invited to find your point of interest and contribution. There are several ways to go about volunteering, but the easiest and quickest is to go to the "SIOP Volunteer System (SVS) Sign-Up Form" (search for "committee volunteers" in my.SIOP, and it will appear in the drop-down). Here you can review information about the work of the various committees and indicate your interest in serving.

So, here's some of what's been going on. I spoke with several people at the Conference interested in building local I-O groups. Thank goodness, the Local I-O Relations (Ad Hoc) Committee chaired by **William Farmer** has been busy this last year. They have been working to improve communications on the web and through TiP, but in addition, they are developing a proposal for SIOP to partner with local I-O groups. In the meantime they have developed a Toolkit for Local I-O Groups, which should help those new groups to get started.

We have signed a contract with a new publisher for the Professional Practice Series: Oxford University Press; many thanks to **Nancy Tippins** (Chair of the PPS Editorial Board) and **Deborah Rupp** (Publications Officer). And while I'm speaking of Deborah, I want to applaud her success in managing and implementing the Corporate Social Responsibility Summit (funded by an NSF grant with SIOP as a sub-awardee), which was held at the Hilton just before our Conference. In addition, with Deborah's leadership, we will initiate a new SIOP book series on Science, Translation, & Application dedicated to linking science and practice across disciplines and promoting evidence-based practice. Moreover, **John Scott** (IOP Editor) and **Mark Poteet** (Forum Editor) are initiating a new section in IOP – the Practitioner's Forum with many exciting implications for sharing, discussing, and improving practice through a variety of formats.

At the EB meeting on Sunday, we considered and approved the new Guidelines for Education and Training in Industrial-Organizational Psychology. This was the culmination of more than two years of

work by an Education and Training Committee subcommittee. Many thanks to subcommittee chair **Stephanie Payne** and E&T Chair **Whitney Morgan**. The Guidelines have been sent to APA where they will go through APA's process to become policy of the Association.

While the E&T work reaches closure, the Task Force (**Paul Sackett** and **Nancy Tippins**, Co-chairs) on a revision to the Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures continues its work with a target of next year to complete their work.

The work of our Government Relations Advocacy Team (GREAT) continues with **Jill Bradley-Geist** as the new Chair. Working with our consultants at Lewis-Burke, our reputation and contacts in government circles continue to expand. Recently, through our membership in the Coalition for National Science Funding (facilitated by Lewis-Burke), **Deb Major** made a very successful presentation of her work on factors affecting undergraduates' persistence in STEM education and career pathways. In addition, the work begun by the late **Jim Outtz** on the Policing Initiative (see the April TiP article) will continue as we seek to find ways to bring our science and practice to bear on a significant national concern.

**Mark Poteet** (outgoing Professional Practice Chair), **Eric Dunleavy** (CSR-EEOC Task Force Chair), and others had an opportunity to meet with EEOC Chair Jenny Yang, **Richard Tonowski**, and others of her senior staff in March to discuss ways that SIOP might be able to assist the Commission with a variety of topics. The meeting was productive, and incoming Professional Practice Chair, **William Shepherd** will continue to work with the Task Force to follow-up.

As part of **Steve Kozlowski**' initiative to leverage self-organization in a multi-level approach to increasing SIOP's impact, **Chris Rotolo** will serve as the "Coordinator-Broker" to facilitate the forming (really the *self-forming*) member groups with common interests. Chris has a number of ideas and plans for approaching this task, but most of them depend on hearing from those who have the common interests and the energy to pursue them. Get involved and find others who share your passion, and we will do what we can to help you get in communication and organized to have an impact.

At the closing Plenary, I had the opportunity to talk about my goals for the coming year. I know that it was at the end of a long day just before an evening of great partying, so I'm assuming that there was interference with long-term memory encoding. So here they are again:

- Celebrate what has been accomplished
- Continue the work that is underway
- Develop a method to scan the horizon for developing trends
- Identify roadblocks to our preparation and adaptation

I've already begun work on the first one in this column by highlighting some of the great work that has been accomplished. The work initiated by **Steve Kozlowski** and many others has been instrumental in building an infrastructure for advocacy. We have completed work on an updated competency model for I-O education and training.

I also described some of the work in progress, such as the Task Force on revising the Principles. The Police Initiative is an on-going advocacy project, and our efforts to work with EEOC will continue as well. Initiatives to translate between science and practice such as the self-organization of members into communities of interest and advocacy and the new Practice Forum in IOP are underway.

Over the next weeks and months, I will be working with Committee Chairs and others on the Executive Board on the latter two goals to develop and formalize how we try to anticipate the future. As a profession, I think we need an enduring method for scanning the horizon. Such a mechanism would seek input from a wide-array of sources, including hearing from those doing cutting-edge research, asking those facing emerging issues, problems, and concerns in the workplace, reviewing both our own literature and that of our I-O colleagues around the world and in other sciences, and monitoring current and developing events. This is a big job, and so far we do not have a comprehensive, cohesive, consistent, and intentional way to go about this scanning or organizing and using the information we obtain. As SIOP works to prepare for and meet the changes ahead, there will undoubtedly be challenges. I believe we are up to this task of preparing for the future. This profession is vital and energetic and continuously self-renewing. Our science and its application has shown itself to be renewably relevant and consistently innovative. We will be ready for tomorrow – we've already started to prepare; we will continue our work, and we will watch for what may come our way – both challenges and opportunities.

### **Cultivating a Future of Meaningful, Impactful, and Transparent Research**

Jessica M. Nicklin  
University of Hartford  
Member, Scientific Affairs Committee

Jennifer L. Gibson  
Fors Marsh Group  
Member, Scientific Affairs Committee

James Grand,  
University of Maryland, College Park  
Chair, Scientific Affairs Committee

### **Cultivating a Future of Meaningful, Important, and Transparent Research**

We live in an ever changing world where technology, globalization, the economy, and the way in which we work are constantly evolving. Our research practices, while slower, are no exception. With advances in methodology, statistical programs, analytic techniques, and theoretical developments our field is continuously moving forward. In order to help SIOP members meet the demands of the future, **The Scientific Affairs Committee** organized two panels addressing a variety of issues concerning research in Industrial / Organizational Psychology. **Jennifer Gibson** facilitated a session entitled: "*Impact of Research Reproducibility and Study Registration on I-O Psychology*," with the following esteemed panelists: **Frank Bosco, Jose Cortina, Ronald Landis, and Gilad Chen**. The primary goal of this panel was to provide a platform for leaders in the field to discuss trends in study registration and research reproducibility, publication bias, and the accumulation of scientific knowledge. **Jessica Nicklin** facilitated a parallel session entitled: "*The Future of the Publication Process in I-O Psychology*" with the following SIOP leaders: **John Antonakis, Janet Barnes-Farrell, Gilad Chen, James LeBreton, and Steven Rogelberg**. This

panel sought to engage in a fruitful discussion of common issues faced by organizational researchers when publishing their research and provide clarity and direction for the future. While the two panels originally had distinct goals and foci, we found that both had similar themes woven throughout. Even more importantly, the themes were consistent with **Outgoing President Steve Kozlowski's** Opening Plenary Message: We need to disrupt equilibrium, create meaningful change, and enhance the impact of our research. He called for us to “get out of our usual place and have an impact.” We seek to share our SIOP Conference experience with the larger I-O Community in hopes that it will generate impactful and meaningful research agendas for the future.

### Panel Highlights

#### Should we Replicate?

Not surprisingly, the topic of *replication* was central to the “*Impact of Research Reproducibility and Study Registration on I-O Psychology*” panel. A substantial point of discussion focused on the **trustworthiness** of the research literature and what research reproducibility and replication do to establish trustworthiness. The panelists began by distinguishing two approaches to verifying research findings. In the first approach, a researcher may redo a study that has been published, using as similar an approach as possible. This is often referred to as a *replication*, although there are many forms of replication (e.g., direct, constructive, theoretical). In the second approach, a researcher may redo the analyses from a study given the raw data and statistical code. This is often referred to as *study reproduction*, or establishing *study reproducibility*. The panelists noted that the latter is a relatively low bar for verification of scientific findings, yet there is evidence that social science research often doesn’t even meet that standard. For example, the *American Journal of Political Science* announced in 2015 that it attempted to reproduce the results of 15 studies and all 15 failed. There was also discussion of what constitutes verification, such as studies finding statistically significant effects, studies finding effects of the same magnitude, or some other criterion. Panelists brought up the issue of quality of evidence and how the qualifications of the researchers conducting replications impact the quality of the replication studies. Although conventions exist for rating quality of research evidence (e.g., GRADE criteria for clinical research), quality is not always integrated into empirical and narrative reviews or other aggregated research.

In “*The Future of the Publication Process in I-O Psychology*”, panelists also discussed the issue of replication; specifically whether there is a place for replication studies when the assumption is that our journals typically seek out new and interesting findings that push the field forward. The panelists generally agreed that replication studies can indeed add value to science. Similar to the other panel, they also noted that different types of replications exist and discussed how some studies, which claim to be replications are sometimes not true replications. They emphasized that there needs to be a compelling question and rationale for the replication – not just “it hasn’t been done” or “it should be done.” They also discussed how you can replicate previous findings without having a complete overlap – by replicating and offering new findings in the same study, which can add substantial value. Regardless of whether the study is a replication or not, they placed significant emphasis on the **quality** of the replication. Thus, they urged for carefully formulated hypotheses and methodology for replications and original studies.

#### Where do Null Findings Belong?

Relatedly, both panels discussed the quandary of “what to do with null findings?” Historically, the publication process has been biased toward findings of statistical significance (e.g., Dickersin, 1993);

however, non-significant results can also be useful for guiding future research and practice (e.g., Mills & Woo, 2012). Panelists on “*The Future of the Publication Process in I-O Psychology*”, all of whom currently or have served as editors for respected journals, suggested that they *would* publish null findings based on the merit of the Introduction and Method sections. While researchers are frequently concerned with reaching statistical significance in order to get published, they consistently emphasized the need to ask **compelling questions** and conduct **rigorous research**.

If results actually matter less than the quality of the question and methodological rigor employed, this further highlights the appeal of exploring alternative models for the publication process. When findings do not work out as anticipated, researchers are more likely to throw out non-significant findings or engage in other questionable research practices (p-Hacking, etc.). However, there are also challenges even when findings *do* work as anticipated. Steven Rogelberg noted during one discussion that because we are so quick to celebrate significant findings that support our hypotheses, there is little incentive to probe our data further. That is, we frequently halt potentially productive discussions with collaborators that may thwart creative discoveries. Failing to support an *a priori* hypothesis prompts us to ask questions, have discussions, and seek alternative explanations for what went “wrong.” Such efforts clearly have the potential to lead to questionable research practices, but this point clearly demonstrates an asymmetry in the motivation of researchers attributable to the incentive structure of the publication process.

The conversations in both panels converged towards the conclusion that it be time for our field to encourage the sharing of null results, rather than placing them in the file drawer. For instance, data sharing initiatives, such as the Harvard Dataverse, allow researchers to contribute their findings, even with null results. The Harvard Dataverse Network is an “open repository which provides a framework to publish, preserve, cite, and get credit for your data, and allow others to replicate and verify your social science research work” ([library.harvard.edu/gdc](http://library.harvard.edu/gdc)). As noted by crowdsourcing research efforts (e.g., Silberzahn & Uhlmann, 2015), different research teams can learn different things from the same data, including but not limited to null findings. This approach would require us, as a field, to be more **collaborative, transparent**, and trusting of our colleagues.

Another approach discussed by both panels was “Hybrid Registered Reports,” which require that authors submit for review the introduction, methods, measurement information, and analysis plan of a completed study (much like a dissertation proposal). For instance, *Journal of Business and Psychology* is engaged in a special initiative (led by Ronald Landis and Steven Rogelberg, among others) to accept Hybrid Registered Reports. Their goal is to “encourage authors to propose conceptually sound, interesting, and methodologically rigorous research without concern for whether the results will be statistically significant.” Other similar efforts have accepted registrations for replication studies. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, for example, has implemented this format to offer collections of independently conducted and direct replications of an original study. While interest in these alternative models of publication has been slow moving, they present possible models of producing “honest” research – where the emphasis is more on learning something new through quality research efforts rather than publishing significant results.

### **Questionable Research Practices.**

Last, a central theme in both panel discussions was the extent to which Questionable Research Practices (QRP; the grey area of acceptable practices preventable within the research community) impact the direction of our research. Examples of QRP include failing to report a dependent variable, collecting

more data to reach a desired *p*-value, HARKing (hypothesizing after results are known), or intentionally fabricating data. Research shows that 31% of organizational psychologists admit to having engaged in at least one QRP (John, Loewenstein, & Prelec, 2012). O’Boyle (2015) reported that in the late 1990s, 42% of first order interaction hypotheses in top journals were supported; that value is significantly higher today (72%) with similar sample sizes and statistical power. The panelists in “*Impact of Research Reproducibility and Study Registration on I-O Psychology*” discussed how this finding could be attributable to the process by which research makes its way to publication in top journals, though other causes such as the technological ease of tests for interactions were also offered.

One might venture a guess that QRPs occur because of the “publish or perish” culture persistent in academia (e.g., Fanelli, 2010), the demands of publishing in top-tier journals, or the expectations and requests of reviewers. We can’t help but draw attention to the irony that even we, as organizational scholars, fall victim to the classic fallacy of “rewarding A while hoping for B.” Our journals have historically rewarded novel findings (Nosek, Spies, & Motyl, 2012); interesting and elaborate theories (e.g., Mathieu, in press); and statistically significant results. In placing these objectives on such a high pedestal, we may be inadvertently promoting the use of QRPs to obtain these rewards rather than rewarding honest, accurate, and impactful research. In sum, QRPs may be an inevitable outcome of a flawed and fouled up reward system.

### A Vision for the Future

The theme of our opening plenary at this year’s SIOP was to disrupt unhealthy equilibriums in our field and enhance the impact of our research. We believe the discussions started by the panelists who participated in our sessions are indicative of the challenging path we face in achieving this goal, and we want to thank our panelists for imparting their experiences and recommendations in this domain. But we must ensure these conversations continue—in our academic institutions, in our professional societies, or even just around the proverbial water cooler. We encourage all members of the SIOP community to consider what we want our field to look like moving forward. We offer a starting point, by focusing on several priorities highlighted in our panels and throughout this article:

- 1. Collaboration, Trustworthiness, and Transparency:** Where and how should we align ourselves along the continuum of recognition based on the open exchange of ideas, thoughts, and data versus recognition based on personal/independent achievement and scholarship? How should we balance the value placed on verifying research and aggregating knowledge (i.e., minimizing Type I errors) versus the value of novelty and potential discovery (i.e., minimizing Type II errors)? Are we willing and able to participate in data sharing and crowdsourcing techniques or is this incompatible with many practical constraints within our field (e.g., intellectual property concerns with sharing organizational data, etc.)? If we favor the former options among each of these questions, then we have a long way to go in making these practices a reality in I-O Psychology. This might include being more receptive to publishing replication studies and null results, making data publicly available, and altering deeply entrenched values/reward structures.
- 2. Research Quality:** We don’t believe anyone wishes to see mediocre studies muddying up our top tier journals. However, are we ready as a field to place more emphasis on *the process* than on the *end result*? What steps can we take to fairly and accurately evaluate the quality of one’s research question and approach? How must our research practices change to improve our comfort and rigor with publishing non-significant findings? To this end, we strongly encourage members in the I-O community to consider submitting their introduction and method sections

to a Hybrid Registered Report for consideration. We echo the sentiments of our panelists that compelling and meaningful questions coupled with rigorous and appropriate methodology should be everyone's top priority (not statistical significance).

3. **Conduct Research that has Impact:** Traditionally we have evaluated impact through the use of citation counts and journal impact factors. But these criteria reflect only a very narrow slice of what it means to be influential through our research. Furthermore, many avenues for achieving impact are seldom appreciated, recognized, or rewarded within our field. For example, to what extent are we willing to conduct "translational"/basic research in collaboration with scholars outside of our discipline? Are we willing to recognize and reward publishing translational research outside of our major I-O journals? To what extent are we willing to treat "non-traditional" indicators of impact (e.g., using blogs and other social media outlets to convey evidence-based principles to the public, engaging in outreach and advocacy of our science to non-academic outlets/groups, etc.) as comparable to traditional indicators of impact? The direction conveyed by our outgoing **SIOP President's** call for impactful research points towards a road less traveled by our field. If we are serious about making an impact, we must be willing to change our views on how and where our resources and forms of recognition are channeled.

## Conclusion

In the immortal words of the late great Yogi Berra, "It's tough to make predictions, especially about the future." However, one prediction is certain—the future we face tomorrow will be shaped by the actions we take today. We would like to encourage every one of our fellow SIOP members to envision the future they hope to see for I-O psychology. What do you value as a scientist/practitioner of IO psychology? How would you like your impact and that of your colleagues to be recognized? The fact such questions—as well as the constructive discussions witnessed during our panels—are being actively encouraged and considered seems indicative that our field is approaching a critical summit. Whether that push maintains its current momentum and continues over the top or rolls back to where we began is an outcome to which we must each contribute and for which we must each take personal responsibility.

## References

- Dickersin, K., & Min, Y. (1993). Publication bias: The problem that won't go away. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 703, 135–148.
- Fanelli, D. (2010). Do pressures to publish increase scientists' bias? An empirical support from US States data. *PLoS ONE*, 5, 1-7. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0010271
- John, L. K., Loewenstein, G. & Prelec, D. (2012). Measuring the prevalence of questionable research practices with incentives for truth telling. *Psychological Science*, 23, 524-532. doi: 10.1177/0956797611430953
- Mills, M. J. & Woo, V. A. (2012). It's not insignificant: I-O psychologists' dilemma of non-significance. *The Industrial/Organizational Psychologist*, 49, 48-54.
- Nosek, B. A., Spies, J. R., & Motyl, M. (2012). Scientific Utopia: II. Restructuring incentives and practices to promote trust over publishability. *Psychological Science*, 7, 615-631. doi: 10.1177/1745691612459058
- O'Boyle, E. H., Banks, G. C., Walter, S., Kameron, C., & Weisenberger, K. (2015, January). What moderates moderators? A meta-analysis of interactions in management research. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2015, No. 1, p. 14779). Academy of Management.
- Silberzahn, R., & Uhlmann, E. L. (October 7, 2015). Crowdsourced research: Many hands make tight work. *Nature News*, 526 (7572). Retrieved from: <http://www.nature.com/news/crowdsourced-research-many-hands-make-tight-work-1.18508>

